

## OPPOSITION TO SOVIET SCHEMES

British favored return of the *status quo ante bellum*, the policy of the latter ran parallel to native Iranian nationalism and patriotism. The pro-British tendencies, therefore, of Seyyed Zia ed-Din could hardly be described as treason. This was in centrist circles. Tudeh activities, characterized by complete subservience to Moscow as evidenced in the oil crisis.

Somewhat in contrast with Americans, the British were confident evidence that they were fully conscious of the real issues involved; from the very beginning of the occupation. The British realized their direct Soviet propaganda and infiltration must be counteracted by direct British action, and that indirect Soviet activities must be met by similar indirect measures. Thus, despite the outwardly official co-operation on higher government levels, a local but very important "cold war" was being waged in Iran between Russia and Great Britain during World War II.

In the following section an attempt will be made to describe British methods of activity, the problems confronted, the advantages and handicaps under which the British labored, and the mistakes they made.

Little needs to be said here about the indirect methods of British policy in the country during the war. In fact, all manifestations of Iranian nationalism and conservatism described in the preceding section may be regarded as an indirect method of British diplomacy, if one considers the degree of British support and encouragement of them. Iranian public opinion ascribed to the British the initiative for bringing Seyyed Zia back from exile. He was considered their anti-Communist trump card. This may not be far

from the truth,  
especially in view of the fact that Seyyid Zia lived in  
British-controlled  
Haifa prior to his return and had to pass through  
equally British-  
controlled Iraq. Rumor also attributed to the British  
heavy financing  
of Seyyid Zia's campaign. Evidence of this is  
obviously lacking in  
view of the secrecy inherent in any such dealings, but  
such financial  
aid is highly probable. It is worth while mentioning,  
howe\er, that  
Seyyid Zia's Vatan party appeared on the scene only  
in late 1943.  
This means, if we credit the British with the  
sponsorship of this  
movement, that they were reluctant to have recourse  
to such an ob-